UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,503	11/17/2006	Rasappa G. Arumugham	15270C-000110US	4013
	7590 01/06/200 AND TOWNSEND AN	EXAMINER		
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			GUDIBANDE, SATYANARAYAN R	
EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	T					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/583,503	ARUMUGHAM ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	SATYANARAYANA R. GUDIBANDE	1654				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH: tute, cause the application to become ABAN	TION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ T	his action is non-final.					
, 	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 380-423 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 380-423 are subject to restriction a	Irawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreing a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. * See the attached detailed Office action for a limit of the priority. 	ents have been received. ents have been received in App riority documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No ceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (RTO 802)	4) [] Internious (2.11)	omony (PTO 412)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I-XXX, claim(s) 381, 382, 390 and 391, drawn to a method of conjugating a peptide immunogen comprising Aβ peptide or fragment via a reactive group of an amino acid residue of a peptide immunogen to a protein/polypeptide carrier having one or more functional groups selected from the group consisting of i) human serum albumin, ii) keyhole limpet hemocyanin(KLH), iii) immunoglobulin molecule, etc.,.....xxx) chemokines.

Each group corresponds to a method of a method of conjugating a peptide immunogen comprising $A\beta$ peptide or fragment via a reactive group of an amino acid residue of a peptide immunogen to a protein/polypeptide carrier, for e.g., group I is drawn to a method of conjugating a peptide immunogen comprising $A\beta$ peptide or fragment via a reactive group of an amino acid residue of a peptide immunogen to human serum albumin, etc.

Group XXXI-LX, claim(s) 399, 400, 405, 406, 411 and 412, drawn to a conjugate of a peptide immunogen comprising Aβ peptide or fragment via a reactive group of an amino acid residue of a peptide immunogen to a protein/polypeptide carrier having one or more functional groups selected from the group consisting of i) human serum albumin, ii) keyhole limpet hemocyanin(KLH), iii) immunoglobulin molecule, etc.,.....xxx) chemokines.

Each group corresponds to a conjugate of a peptide immunogen comprising $A\beta$ peptide or fragment via a reactive group of an amino acid residue of a peptide immunogen to a protein/polypeptide carrier, for e.g., group I is drawn to a conjugate of a peptide immunogen comprising $A\beta$ peptide or fragment via a reactive group of an amino acid residue of a peptide immunogen to human serum albumin, etc.

Group LXI-XC, claim(s) 418 and 419, drawn to a method of inducing an immune response in a mammalian subject comprising administering an effective composition comprising a conjugate of peptide immunogen with a protein/polypeptide carrier, wherein the protein/peptide carrier selected from the group consisting of i) human serum albumin, ii) keyhole limpet hemocyanin(KLH), iii) immunoglobulin molecule, etc.,....xxx) chemokines.

Each group corresponds to a method of inducing an immune response in a mammalian subject comprising administering an effective composition comprising a conjugate of peptide immunogen with a protein/polypeptide carrier, for e.g., group I is drawn to a method of inducing

an immune response in a mammalian subject comprising administering an effective composition comprising a conjugate of peptide immunogen to human serum albumin, etc.

Claims 380, 383-389 and 392-397 link(s) inventions I-XXX. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 380, 383-389 and 392-397. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Claims 398, 401-404, 407-410 and 413-416 link(s) inventions XXXI-LX. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 398, 401-404, 407-410 and 413-416. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional

application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Claims 417 and 420-423 link(s) inventions LXI-XC. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 417 and 420-423. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

According to PCT Rule 13.2, unity of invention exists only when the shared or corresponding technical feature is a contribution over the prior art. The inventions listed as Groups I-XC do not relate to a single general inventive concept because they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature. The technical feature of Group II is method of conjugating a peptide immunogen comprising Aβ peptide via a reactive group of an amino acid

to a derivatized carrier protein, which is shown by Shimizu, 2002, Journal of Neuroscience Research, 70, 451-461. Shimizu discloses the conjugation of DAEFRH-(L-isoAsp)-SGYEVC [Aβ1-12(L-isoAsp7) + C] and acetyl-AE-(L-isoAsp)-VGSNKC [Aβ21–28(L-isoAsp23) + C], respectively, and conjugated to maleimide-activated KLH 9page 452, column 2). Hence, the special technical feature of group II of instant invention does not make a contribution over the prior art. Therefore, the groups' I-XC lacks unity of invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper

restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species **peptide** immunogen comprising of $A\beta$ peptide or $A\beta$ fragments or analogs thereof. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of Aβ peptide or fragments or analogs thereof with a structure of the peptide or with a SEQ ID NO with all the variable (if any present) clearly defined to represent a single structure for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 380, 383-385, 389, 392-395, 398, 400-404, 407-410, 413-417 and 420-422 are generic.

Claims **386 and 395 are** generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: **crosslinking agents**. The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of cross linking agent with a structure of the compound wherein all the variables are clearly identified to represent a single structure for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species **capping reagents**. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Application/Control Number: 10/583,503

Art Unit: 1654

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of capping reagent for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 388, 389, 397, 398 and 404 are generic.

Page 7

Claims 389, 398 and 404 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: structures of conjugate of immunogen and protein carrier. The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of conjugate of a structure with a chemical structure or a molecule wherein all the variables (if any present) are clearly identified to represent a single molecule for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

Application/Control Number: 10/583,503

Art Unit: 1654

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

Page 8

- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satyanarayana R. Gudibande whose telephone number is 571-272-8146. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/583,503 Page 9

Art Unit: 1654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Satyanarayana R Gudibande/ Examiner, Art Unit 1654

> /Andrew D Kosar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654